DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 208 SP 008 568

AUTHOR Thompson, Bruce
TITLE A Typological Listing of the Philosophical Assumptions of a Humanistic Competency-Based Teacher Education Program.
INSTITUTION Houston Univ., Tex. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 27 Nov 74
NOTE 13p.; For related documents, see SP 008 565-567

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Philosophy; *Humanism; Humanization; *Performance Based Teacher Education; *Philosophy; *Typology

ABSTRACT

This paper constructs a typology of the philosophical assumptions of a humanistic, competency based, teacher education program. At the same time, the paper fills in the assumptions of the typology. It is indicated that the listing of assumptions is characterized by completeness, sequential ordering, and the fact that it is non-compromised. The assumptions in this listing are broken up into the following groups: (a) person's assumptions, (b) learning assumptions, (c) general teacher education assumptions, (d) general constituency assumptions, (e) some self-de-selection methodological assumptions, (f) personalization assumptions, (g) individualization assumptions, (h) objective assumptions, (i) behavioral objectives assumptions, (j) generation of objectives assumptions, (k) enabling activity assumptions, (l) individualizing enabling activity assumptions, (m) genesis of enabling activities, (n) pre-enabling activities assessment, (o) assessment-grading assumptions, and (p) philosophy value assumptions. The assumptions for each group are displayed in outline form. (JA)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A TYPOLOGICAL LISTING OF THE PHILOSOPHICAL ASSUMPTIONS OF A HUMANISTIC COMPETENCY-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Bruce Thompson

> Assumptions are presupposed valid; that is, they are accepted statements to which a majority of program developers agree. This is not to say that assumptions will remain static or that some assumptions will not be found to be faulty. However, at the present time these statements of value, unproved fact, or unusual or focal definition are tentatively accepted as valid.

This paper is an attempt to construct a typology of the philosophical assumptions of a humanistic competency-based teacher education program. At the same time, this paper is also an attempt to fill in the assumptions of the typology. This listing of assumptions will, however, hopefully be unique to the extent that it will incorporate all three of the following qualities:

1. *COMPLETENESS*. Even to the extent that program developers disagree as to the validity of any assumptions and/or the implications of these assumptions, won't specificity of assumption presentation at least force confrontation of any differences of opinion as may exist? If truth emerges from an adversary process, this confrontation may facilitate production of a real and very helpful implementation concensus.

2. *SEQUENTIAL ORDERING*. To the extent that the ordering of assumptions is sequential, thus hopefully it will be easier to view the program as a whole, and avoid such contradictions as may arise from too specific a non-sequential perspective.

3. *NON-COMPROMISED.* If program developers implement programs on the foundation of a philosophy, should not the initial program philosophy at least at first be idealistic? Compromises to the mandates of reality can then be consciously made with better understanding of modification impacts.

This philosophy may also be unique in terms of its humanistic emphasis. CBTE does not have to be humanistic; nor does it have to be mechanistic. CBTE can be either humanistic or mechanistic.

What characteristics of the approach militate for CBTE being either humanistic or mechanistic? Behavioral objectives can bias a program toward being mechanistic in tone. But behavioral objectives can also bias a program in the opposite direction. What is the implication of an instructor openly telling you what he would like you to learn, and how he will evaluate your learning?

Student self-instructional use of modules can free professionals from having to interact with students. Self-instruction can also free professors to interact more personally with students.

This list consists of assumptions about both the ends and the means of teacher education. Transitional assumptions are typed in Gothic type. Definitional assumptions are typed in *ITALIC COURIER*. Focal assumptions are typed in ORATOR.

PERSONS ASSUMPTIONS

1. PEOPLE AS PEOPLE HAVE VALUE.
2. Persons derive their value from their unique ability to encounter.
3. *ENCOUNTER IS A PROCESS WHEREIN PERSONS IDENTIFY WITH THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT OR THE THOUGHTS OR FEELINGS OF OTHER PERSONS.*

LEARNING ASSUMPTIONS

1. People can learn.
2. *LEARNING IS THAT PROCESS WHEREIN INDIVIDUALS INTERNALIZE FACTS AND/OR THE ABILITY TO SYNTHESIZE FACTS INTO CREATIVE NEW IDEAS.*
3. Valuing is a learned activity.
4. Thus valuing encounter is a learned activity.
5. Thus groups socialize their members as to the importance of establishing and maintaining social relationships.
6. The ability to encounter is a learned activity.
7. Groups socialize their members as to the methods of establishing and maintaining social relationships.
8. Learning to learn is itself a learned process.
9. Groups socialize their members as to the importance and methods of learning to learn.
10. To facilitate this socialization, society has created the roles of "instructor" and "learner."
11. *"INSTRUCTOR" IS THE ROLE OF THAT PERSON WHOSE BEHAVIOR AT A GIVEN POINT IN TIME MAINLY INVOLVES IMPARTING NEW KNOWLEDGE OR SKILLS TO ANOTHER PERSON.*
12. *"LEARNER" IS THE ROLE OF THAT PERSON WHOSE BEHAVIOR AT A GIVEN POINT IN TIME MAINLY INVOLVES RECEIVING NEW KNOWLEDGE OR SKILLS FROM ANOTHER PERSON.*
13. Every person possesses some knowledge or skill which enables him to facilitate the learning of others.

14. No individual possesses all that knowledge or skill which would enable him to perfectly facilitate the learning of all others.

15. THUS, IN EDUCATION NO PERSON SHOULD ALWAYS BE VIEWED AS "INSTRUCTOR," NOR SHOULD ANY PERSON ALWAYS BE VIEWED AS "LEARNER."

GENERAL TEACHER EDUCATION ASSUMPTIONS[1]

1. As learning to learn has value, thus education has value.

2. Teaching is a learned activity.

3. *"TEACHER EDUCATION" IS TEACHING OTHERS HOW TO TEACH.*

4. As education implies teaching, and as education has value, thus teacher education has value.

5. The "good" teacher is cognizant of and responsive to learner needs.

6. Before a person can respond to learner needs, the person must first cope with concerns about self as instructor.

7. Before a person can cope with concerns about self as instructor, the person must first cope with concerns about self as person.

8. AS THE GOAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION IS TO PRODUCE TEACHERS WHO RESPOND TO LEARNER EMOTIONAL AND INTELLECTUAL NEEDS, THUS TEACHER EDUCATION MUST FACILITATE LEARNERS' ATTEMPTS TO COPE WITH CONCERNS ABOUT SELF AS PERSON OR WITH CONCERNS ABOUT SELF AS INSTRUCTOR.

A. FLEXIBILITY ASSUMPTIONS:

   1. Education is rapidly changing in response to continual social, economic, and political change.

   2. We can not perfectly know the future.

   3. Therefore teacher education should teach student-instructors to be receptive to change.

   4. Different pupils may prefer to learn in different ways.

---

[1] Assumptions 5-8 from Frances F. Fuller, "Personalized Education for Teachers," (Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin, July, 1970), pp. 16-17.

5. Teachers then tend to be more effective if they are able to employ several different styles of teaching.

6. Therefore students should be taught the ability to employ a variety of teaching styles.

7. Teachers tend to be more effective if, given the instructional situation, the teachers rationally select teaching strategies.

8. THEREFORE STUDENTS SHOULD BE TAUGHT TO BE RATIONAL DECISION-MAKERS.

B. ROLE PERCEPTION ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Most students like to feel that teachers view them as persons who are equals in many ways.

2. Then teachers tend to be more effective if they perceive themselves as facilitators as well as dispensers.

3. THEREFORE STUDENTS SHOULD BE TAUGHT TO PERCEIVE THEMSELVES AS FACILITATORS AS WELL AS DISPENSERS.

4. Teachers can consciously teach only that which they already know.

5. Students will learn more from their pupils if they perceive each teaching experience to be a learning experience for them as well as for their pupils.

6. THEREFORE STUDENTS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO PERCEIVE EACH TEACHING EXPERIENCE AS A LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR THEMSELVES AS WELL AS FOR THEIR PUPILS.

C. FIELD-EXPERIENCE ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Teacher education tends to be more responsive to the needs and wants of society if teacher education is considered the job of more than just the college of education.

2. Teacher education exists to serve society, and therefore teacher education programs should be responsive to the needs and wants of society.

3. Also, the learning of student-instructors is enhanced if student-learners are shown WHILE they are told.

4. THEREFORE TEACHER EDUCATION SHOULD PLACE A HEAVY EMPHASIS ON FIELD EXPERIENCE.

GENERAL CONSTITUENCY ASSUMPTIONS

A. PROGRAM ENTERANCE ASSUMPTIONS:

1. All persons can overcome concerns about self as person as well as concerns about self as teacher.

2. All persons can learn.

3. THUS ALL PERSONS WHO SEEK ADMISSION INTO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE ADMITTED.

B. DE-SELECTION ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Students who self-select out of teacher education may well self-select into other disciplines which may hold greater happiness for them.

2. Education is an important societal function.

3. To the extent that poor student-instructors de-select out of the teaching profession, to this extent society will be better off.

4. THUS TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD FORCE OR ENCOURAGE SOME STUDENTS TO DE-SELECT OUT OF TEACHER EDUCATION.

C. SELF-DE-SELECTION ASSUMPTIONS:

1. Fair criteria for other-de-selection are most difficult to develop and apply.

2. Self-de-selection requires no program-imposed de-selection criteria.

3. Also, self-de-selection enhances human value by respecting individual freedom.

4. THUS TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD EMPHASIZE SELF-DE-SELECTION OVER OTHER-DE-SELECTION.

SOME SELF-DE-SELECTION METHODOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS

1. The greater the extent to which this philosophy is shared with student-instructors, the greater will be the extent that student-instructors with low professional commitment will self-de-select from the program.

2. THUS THIS PHILOSOPHY SHOULD BE SHARED WITH STUDENTS TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE.

3. All persons do not accept themselves for what they are and would be.

4. Programs with structured-in group process confront individuals with decision situations as regards self-acceptance.

5. Group process implies encounter.

6. Individuals who do not accept themselves will not be able to accept others, and thus will not be able to tolerate extensive close group process.

7. If individuals choose to change and accept self and others, group process will facilitate such modification.

8. If individuals decide not to accept themselves, and if extensive group process is structured into the program, then such individuals will choose to de-select themselves from the program.

9. THUS TEACHER EDUCATION SHOULD IN SOME MEASURE STRUCTURE IN ENCOUNTER.

PERSONALIZATION ASSUMPTIONS

1. Given our limited resources and virtually unlimited needs, thus optimal learning is desirable.

2. Learning is best facilitated and perhaps only possible within a collaborative relationship.

3. Thus teacher education should occur within a collaborative relationship.

4. *A COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIP IS A RELATIONSHIP WHEREIN LEARNERS AND INSTRUCTORS IDENTIFY WITH EACH OTHER'S THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS, RECOGNIZE EACH OTHER'S WORK, PLAY, AND LOVE STRENGTHES AND WEAKNESSES, AND ATTEMPT TO FOSTER EACH OTHER'S PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAD GROWTH.*

5. IN OTHER WORDS, TEACHER EDUCATION SHOULD BE PERSONALIZED.

INDIVIDUALIZATION ASSUMPTIONS

1. A collaborative relationship can exist only where persons view each other as individuals.

2. THUS ALL PERSONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION SHOULD VIEW EACH OTHER AS INDIVIDUALS, PERSONS WHO EACH WORK, PLAY, AND LOVE DIFFERENTLY.

OBJECTIVES ASSUMPTIONS

1. *AN INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE IS A STATEMENT AS TO WHAT WILL BE LEARNED AND HOW THE LEARNING WILL BE EVALUATED.*

2. Instructional objectives give meaning and structure to the pursuit of knowledge and skills.

3. Such structure facilitates learning.

4. THUS PERSONS RIGHTLY SPECIFY LEARNING OBJECTIVES IN TEACHING INSTRUCTIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS.

BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES ASSUMPTION

1. *A BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVE SPECIFIES LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA IN TERMS OF PRECISE OBSERVABLE BEHAVIORS.*

2. Teacher education programs give academic credit.

3. Academic credit inherently implies evaluation.

4. Thus evaluation is an inherent facet of teacher preparation.

5. Teacher education programs recommend learners for certification.

6. Certification decisions imply evaluation.

7. Thus, again, evaluation is an inherent facet of teacher preperation.

8. Unfairness in academic or certification evaluation undermines the collaborative learner-instructor relationship.

9. Thus unfairness in evaluation undermines the effectiveness of teacher education.

10. Achievement of behavioral objectives is most fairly measurable.

11. THUS LEARNING OBJECTIVES OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE STATED BEHAVIORALLY.

GENERATION OF OBJECTIVES ASSUMPTIONS

1. Objectives derive their value only from the extent to which they enable students to become improved teachers.

2. Individuals will learn only those knowledge-skills which they feel are important.

3. Persons vary in their individual biases as to what is to be valued.

4. Open learner-instructor interaction results in personal affective growth.

5. Open learner-instructor interaction may also expose persons to new information.

6. Thus openness results also in personal cognitive growth.

7. Learner-instructor interaction may cause instructor re-evaluation as to what specific objectives students should be required to pursue.

8. The growth which results from such interaction may also cause learner re-evaluation as to what instructional objectives are important or not important.

9. Such interactive re-evaluation of objectives' imports will tend to identify objectives which are censensually seen as being valuable.

10. Such openness will reinforce the collaborative relationship between teacher education learners and instructors.

11. Thus negotiation as to what instructional objectives should be pursued inherently results in greater probability that learning will occur.

12. THUS STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD NEGOTIATE AS TO WHAT OBJECTIVES SHOULD BE SOUGHT IN THE STUDY OF THE DISCIPLINE.

13. Yet time constraints limit open negotiation or discussion.

14. Thus even after an extended period of negotiation individuals will undoubtedly feel different as to the appropriateness of given objectives.

15. Instructors may have high certitude unshared by learners as to the appropriateness of given objectives.

16. As the "instructor" as person has value, then perhaps teachers should have the right to require in some instances that learners meet objectives which the learners do not immediately recognize as being relevant.

17. Learners may have high certitude unshared by instructors regarding the appropriateness of given objectives.

18. As the "learner" as person has value, then perhaps students should have the right to refuse in some instances to meet objectives which instructors do not immediately recognize as being unimportant.

19. Numerical limit on the excercise of such veto prerogatives would undermine the collaborative learner-instructor relationship and thus also undermine learning of knowledge-skills.

20. Thus numerical limits should not be imposed on the exercise of veto prerogatives.

21. To the extent that the collaborative relationship is meaningful, decisions as to the exercise of these prerogatives will be based on intensity of beliefs and the nature of objectives themselves.

22. THUS THE GIVE-AND-TAKE OF THE COLLABORATIVE LEARNER-INSTRUCTOR RELATIONSHIP SHOULD SERVE AS THE REGULATOR ON THE EXERCISE OF THESE PREROGATIVES.

23. Individuals may have high certitude unshared by instructors as to the appropriateness of given objectives.

24. A learner pursuing such objectives requires little of instructors.

25. AS THE "LEARNER" AS PERSON HAS VALUE, THUS EACH STUDENT SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES WHICH ONLY HE SEES AS VALUABLE.

ENABLING ACTIVITY ASSUMPTIONS

1. All students are not able to perform instructional objectives immediately upon enterance into given teacher education programs.

2. THUS IN TEACHING PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS, PERSONS RIGHTLY SELECT ENABLING ACTIVITIES TO FACILITATE STUDENT PERFORMANCE OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES.

INDIVIDUALIZING ENABLING ACTIVITIES ASSUMPTIONS

1. Individuals vary such that learning activities will require different investment of time and effort by each student.

2. For each student and each objective there is one enabling activity which would require least effort-time of each student in completion of each objective.

3. The learner will resent the instructor who requires investment of more than the minimal effort or time which would be required for optimal completion of enabling activities.

4. Utilization of non-optimally effective enabling activities is by definition wasteful.

5. THUS IDEALLY ONLY INDIVIDUALIZED ENABLING ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE UTILIZED IN THE PURSUIT OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES.

GENESIS OF ENABLING ACTIVITIES

1. Yet enabling activities flow in some measure as natural consequences of already negotiated behavioral objectives.

2. Thus instructors can appropriately suggest enabling activities for specific negotiated objectives.

3. However, students each learn best by performing different enabling activities.

4. Students sometimes feel that they themselves are best able to determine what are optimally effective enabling activities.

5. Suggestion of multiple enabling activities structures in student options.

6. Existence of such options reinforces the collaborative learner-instructor relationship.

7. THUS WHERE INSTRUCTORS OFFER ENABLERS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES THEY SHOULD PROVIDE SEVERAL ENABLERS FOR EACH OBJECTIVE.

8. Teaching should be client-centered.

9. Enabling activities derive their value only to the extent that they enable students to achieve instructional objectives.

10. Instructors should care only that learners reach instructional objectives, and not care how the students get there.

11. THUS STUDENTS SHOULD NOT BE REQUIRED TO NEGOTIATE AS TO THE ACTIVITIES THEY CHOOSE TO PERFORM IN PURSUIT OF OBJECTIVES PERFORMANCE.

PRE-ENABLING ACTIVITIES ASSESSMENT

1. Learners can not learn that which they already know.

2. Learners resent attempts to teach them that which they already know.

3. Such resentment undermines the valuable collaborative learner-instructor relationship.

4. Pre-activity credit by challenge avoids attempts to teach individuals that which they already know.

5. THUS PRE-ACTIVITIES CREDIT BY CHALLENGE SHOULD BE A PART OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

ASSESSMENT-GRADING ASSUMPTIONS

1. The only appropriate evaluation question for an objective is the objective itself.

2. But one either performs or does not perform a behavioral objective.

3. Thus one can not fairly grade students on the degree to which they perform behavioral objectives.

4. The primal goal of teacher education is to produce competent teachers.

5. There is little if any correlation between rate of objective performance and quality of learning.

6. Thus measuring rate of objective performance is not an acceptable assessment procedure.

7. Also, measuring an individual's rate of learning against other's rates of learning would violate the thrust of an individualized personalized teacher preparation program.

8. THUS ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE SHOULD NOT BE TIME-BASED, ONLY COMPETENCY-BASED.

9. Thus students can only differentiate themselves into one of two categories.

10. Incompent students should not be certified to teach.

11. THUS ONE CATEGORY WHICH LEARNERS IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD HAVE THE OPTION OF DIFFERENTIATING THEMSELVES INTO IS THE "NOT YET" OR THE "I" CATEGORY.

12. In a two category system of assessment where one category has been generated, but one category remains to be identified.

13. Selection of the other category from among the B, C, or D categories would disallow the student the option of making A's.

14. Not being able to make A's would inherently undermine the students' abilities to attain high cumulative grade point averages.

15.

15. Some students might well resent such restriction.

16. Such resentment would undermine the valuable collaborative learner-instructor relationship.

17. Thus the remaining evaluative category must not be drawn from the C, B, or D categories.

18. Utilizing the A category as the remaining category would inherently disallow the student the option of differentiating himself into the B, C, or D categories.

19. This would probably cause favorable distortion in the student's cumulative grade point average.

20. This distortion would probably dismay both college administrators and school district hiring personnel.

21. The only other available assessment category is the pass category.

22. The pass assessment category will not distort grade point averages, nor cause any other significant problems.

23. THUS PASS-I IS THE ONLY LEGITIMATE GRADING SYSTEM TO BE USED IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

PHILOSOPHY VALUE ASSUMPTIONS

1. To be valuable this philosophy must to some extent be capable of implementation.

2. All universities are constantly changing.

3. Thus perhaps the program mandated in this philosophy can to some extent be implemented.

4. Thus perhaps this philosophy has value.

5. No philosophy of education can be perfectly cogent or realistic.

6. THUS THIS TEACHER EDUCATION PHILOSOPHY MUST BE CONSIDERED AS TRANSITORY AND FLEXIBLE AND IN CONSTANT NEED OF RESPONSIVE MODIFICATIONS.